REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification for lack of antecedent basis for the term "computer readable medium" in Claim 6. The Examiner further rejected Claims 6, 7, 10, 22 and 11, 12, 15, 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the use of the term "means for" in the claims. The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 2, 5 - 7, 10 - 12, 15 – 17 and 20 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the use of claim elements "dispatching ..." and "sending ...". Then, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaughnessy et al. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaughnessy et al. in view of Johnson, II et al.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the page and line numbers for the support of the added limitations in the amended/new claims did not correspond to page and line numbers of the Specification on record. Applicants have ensured that page and line numbers in the present Response coincide with those in the Application on record.

In response to the objection to the Specification, Applicants have amended Claim 6 to replace the term "computer readable medium" with the term "data storage medium," which can be found on page 9, line 18 of the originally-filed Application.

Applicants believe that the objection has been overcome and kindly request its withdrawal.

In response to the rejection of Claims 6, 7, 10, 22 and 11, 12, 15, 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the use of the term "means for" in the claims, Applicants amended the claims to delete the term "means for".

Applicants believe that the above-rejection has been overcome and kindly request its withdrawal.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5 - 7, 10 - 12, 15 – 17 and 20 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the use of claim elements "dispatching …" and "sending …," Applicants have deleted the "sending" element. Thus, the rejection becomes moot.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 to better claim the invention. Specifically, the claims are amended to read as shown in Claim 1 below:

1. (Currently amended) A method of executing ~~one remote~~ a software management utility command concurrently on ~~a plurality of remote~~ computer systems on a network, each computer system on the network having a network address and a software management utility running thereon, the method comprising ~~the steps of~~:

cross-referencing into a table each computer system on the network to the network address of the computer system and to the software management utility running on the computer system **(see Fig. 5 and page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 22)**;

entering the ~~remote~~ software management utility command on a command line in a local command interface; **(see page 12, lines 18 - 23 and page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 4)**

specifying in the local command interface a plurality of computer systems on the network on which the software management utility command is to be concurrently executed; **(see page 13, lines 10 – 14 and page 13, lines 18 - 21)**

~~entering an address for each one of the plurality of remote computer systems in a group section in the local command interface;~~

~~sending the command for execution by the plurality of remote computer systems;~~

~~automatically~~ determining~~, in response to sending the command for execution,~~ whether each one of the plurality of computer systems specified in the local command interface is accessible; **(see page 14, lines 11 – 15)**

deleting, in response to determining that a specified computer system is not accessible, the specified computer system from the local command interface ~~the address of each one of the plurality of computer systems that is determined to be not accessible from the group section~~ **(see page 14, lines 15 – 17)**;

mapping the software management utility command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems remaining in the local command interface **(see page 10, line 24 to page 11, line 5)**;

dispatching, using the cross-referenced network address of the computer systems remaining in the local software command interface, ~~said command~~ the corresponding commands to the computer systems remaining in the local command interface ~~that are determined to be accessible in order for the command to be concurrently executed by each one of the computer systems whose address is left in the group section~~ **(see page 16, lines 10 – 12)**; and

~~returning a result~~ displaying an output of the execution of the command by each one of the plurality of computer systems that concurrently executed the software management utility command in the local command interface **(see page 21, lines 3 - 9)** ~~to which the command is dispatched~~.

Due to the amendment of Claim 1, Claims 2, 5 and 21 are amended for proper antecedent bases as well as to better claim the invention. Claims 2, 5 and 21 are shown immediately below.

2. (Currently amended) The method of Claim 21 wherein ~~said step of automatically~~ determining whether each one of the plurality of computer systems specified in the local command interface is accessible ~~the computer systems accessibility~~ includes ~~the step of~~ pinging each of said computer systems **(see page 14, lines 11 – 15)**.

5. (Currently amended) The method of Claim 2 further including ~~the step of automatically~~ re-dispatching, after an execution error has been corrected, the command for execution to a computer system that failed to execute the software management utility command successfully ~~and was corrected~~ **(see page 18, line 25 to page 19, line 9 and page 19, line 31 to page 20, line 4)**.

21. (Currently amended) The method of Claim 1 wherein the ~~result~~ output of the execution of the command is streamed **(see page 14, lines 18 - 20)**.

Applicants herein present new Claims 25 – 28 for consideration. Claim 25 is reproduced immediately below.

25. (New) The method of Claim 1 wherein mapping the software management utility command entered in the local command interface onto the plurality

of corresponding commands includes determining, using the table, whether the software management utility command entered in the local command interface can be translated into the corresponding command of the software management utility running on each one of the plurality of the specified computer systems and generating an error message in response to determining that the software management utility command entered in the local command interface cannot be translated into the corresponding command of the software management utility running on a computer system of the plurality of the specified computer systems **(see page 22, lines 1 – 11)**.

Note that Claims 1, 2, 5, 21 and 25 reproduced immediately above are method claims. Claims 6, 7, 10, 22 and 26 are computer program product counterpart claims of the method claims. Claims 11, 12, 15, 23 and 27 are apparatus counterpart claims of the method claims while Claims 16, 17, 20, 24 and 28 are computer system counterpart claims of the method claims.

In the method claims above, support for all newly-added limitations in a claim is shown in the respective claim.

In the interest of brevity, Applicants omit to reproduce the counterpart claims with support for the newly-added limitations therein since the program product, apparatus and computer system counterpart claims include the same added limitations as those of the method claims.

Since, support for all newly-added limitations are in the originally-filed Application, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added to the Application.

By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, 5 – 7, 10 – 12, 15 – 17 and 20 – 28 are pending in the Application. For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

> 1. A method of executing a software management utility command concurrently on computer systems on a network, each computer system on the network having a network address and a software management utility running thereon, the method comprising:
>
> ***cross-referencing into a table each computer system on the network to the network address of the computer system and to the software management utility running on the computer system***;
>
> ***entering the software management utility command on a command line in a local command interface***;
>
> ***specifying in the local command interface a plurality of computer systems on the network on which the command is to be concurrently executed***;
>
> ***determining whether each one of the plurality of computer systems specified in the local command interface is accessible***;
>
> ***deleting, in response to determining that a specified computer system is not accessible, the specified computer system from the local command interface***;
>
> ***mapping the software management utility command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems remaining in the local command interface***;
>
> dispatching, using the cross-referenced network address of the computer systems remaining in the local software command interface, the corresponding commands to the computer systems remaining in the local command interface; and
>
> ***displaying an output of the execution of the command by each one of the plurality of computer systems that concurrently executed the software management utility command in the local command interface***. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are patentable over the applied references.

Shaughnessy et al. purport to teach a method of forwarding messages to one or more user devices presently available to an intended recipient. According to the teachings of Shaughnessy et al., a central agent is coupled to a plurality of communication networks. The central agent, in response to a detected incoming message, identifies: (1) a message recipient for whom the incoming message is destined, (2) the known user devices associated with that recipient, and (3) the networks servicing the identified user devices. The agent then polls all identified networks to determine which have user devices presently available and selects one or more of those devices to receive the incoming message. The incoming message can be modified and transformed, in accordance with predetermined action rules, before transmitting the incoming message, in whole or in part, to the available user devices.

However, Shaughnessy et al. do not teach ***cross-referencing into a table each computer system on the network to the network address of the computer system and to the software management utility running on the computer system; entering the software management utility command on a command line in a local command interface***; ***specifying in the local command interface a plurality of computer systems on the network on which the command is to be concurrently executed***; ***determining whether each one of the plurality of computer systems specified in the local command interface is accessible***; ***deleting, in response to determining that a specified computer system is not accessible, the specified computer system from the local command interface***; ***mapping the software management utility command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems remaining in the local command interface***; and ***displaying an***

output of the execution of the command by each one of the plurality of computer systems that concurrently executed the software management utility command in the local command interface as in the claimed invention.

Johnson, II et al. purport to teach a system and method for evaluating the operation of a computer over a computer network. In so doing, Johnson, II et al. disclose a scheme that permits a user, such as a network administrator, to remotely initiate and control diagnostics of a node of a networked system. That is, Johnson, II et al. disclose a system in which a user may select a diagnostic routine that is to be executed. This diagnostic routine may instruct a managed node to collect configuration or other data and relay the data back to the diagnostic control, which may then be reported to the user. The data may indicate whether a malfunctioning application on the node, such as a print server, is "pingable".

However, just as in the case of Shaughbessy et al., Johnson, II et al. do not teach ***cross-referencing into a table each computer system on the network to the network address of the computer system and to the software management utility running on the computer system; entering the software management utility command on a command line in a local command interface***; ***specifying in the local command interface a plurality of computer systems on the network on which the command is to be concurrently executed***; ***determining whether each one of the plurality of computer systems specified in the local command interface is accessible***; ***deleting, in response to determining that a specified computer system is not accessible, the specified computer system from the local command interface***; ***mapping the software management utility command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems remaining in the local command interface***; and ***displaying an output of the execution of the command by each one of***

the plurality of computer systems that concurrently executed the software management utility command in the local command interface as in the claimed invention.

Consequently, Shaughnessy et al., alone or in combination with Johnson et al., do not teach the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, are allowable over the applied references. Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16, which all incorporate the above-emboldened-italicized limitations in the above-reproduced claim 1, together with their dependent claims are likewise allowable over the applied references. Hence, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Volel Emile/ Registration No. 39,969
Volel Emile
Attorney for Appellants
(512) 306 - 7969